

REMARKS

Claims 1-26, 29 and 30 are currently pending in the application. Claims 5-7, 21-25 and 29 are allowed.

Claims 4, 9-14 and 18-20 stand objected to as each depending upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 2-4 and 8-20 stand objected to because of an antecedent basis problem.

Claims 1-3, 8, 15-17 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,803,532 (Taxon). Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,476,119 (Van Nagell).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8, 15-17, 26 and 30 is requested.

The Examiner notes in paragraph 10 of the Action that claim 1 was changed in the October 5, 2005 Response filed by the applicant and that claim 1, as presented in Applicant's June 2, 2005 response was allowable. In the October 5, 2005 response, combination claim 1 was inadvertently replaced by a method claim. Applicant is submitting herewith claim 1, as presented in the June 2, 2005 response, and allowed, with some additional amendments thereto. Applicant regrets the inconvenience caused by the above error.

Claim 1, as presented, incorporates limitations similar to those in objected to claims 19 and 20. That is, a fluid blower is claimed as part of the combination. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable.

Claims 2-4 and 8-20 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

Claim 30 has also been amended to recite the first and second tubular elements in combination with a portable fluid blower to distinguish more clearly over Van Nagell.

Claim 26 recites, among other limitations, that the first and second connecting assemblies cooperate so that the first and second circumferentially facing surfaces confront each other with the first and second tubular elements in the second relative rotational position to thereby block relative movement of the first and second tubular elements from the second relative rotational position back into the first relative rotational position.

Taxon is devoid of any corresponding structure and does not suggest the same. Accordingly, claim 26 is believed allowable.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 8, 15-17, 26 and 30 and allowance of the case are requested.


Respectfully submitted,

By


John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date:


June 17, 2007